

Section III:
AMENDMENT UNDER 37 CFR §1.121 to the
DRAWINGS

No amendments or changes to the Drawings are proposed.

Section IV:
AMENDMENT UNDER 37 CFR §1.121
REMARKS

Summary of Telephone Interview

On May 14, 2007, Applicants' agent, Robert H. Frantz, Examiner Kumar, and Supervisory Examiner Myhre held an interview by telephone to discuss an amendment proposed by Applicants' agent. Applicants proposed the amendments shown herein with the intent to advance prosecution to allowance in the next office action. Applicants believe that the added elements, steps, and/or limitations place the claims clearly in a position for allowance over the art of record.

Although official agreement regarding patentability was not reached, all in attendance believed that the proposed amendment would likely place the claims in a condition for allowance, especially with regard to the addition of the claim step, element, or limitation which recites generation of a footnote, endnote, or bibliographical entry.

Applicants hereby submit the proposed amendment in formal form. Applicants appreciate Examiner Kumar's and Examiner Myhre's time and input received during the interview.

Claim Objections

In the Office Action, an objection to Claim 1 was made regarding an apparent typographical error " . . . an indicator of said an identity of said user". Applicants have discovered the same error in Claims 12 and 23, as well. The present amendment corrects these errors. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

In the Office Action, claims 1 - 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for being unpatentable over US Patent 6,735,701 to Jacobson (hereinafter "Jacobson") in view of non-patent literature "Snag-it User's Guide" by TechSmith Corporation (hereinafter "Snag-it").

Applicants believe the proposed amendment to the claims clearly distinguish over the cited references in the following ways:

(1) Applicants' verbatim quoting (e.g. direct copying) sequence is the reverse of the traditional copying sequence. Normally, a user finds or locates the item to be copied, selects it, operates a copy command, and then selects a location where that copy should be placed. This is a source first, destination second sequence. Applicants' method, however, uses the reverse of this normal process, wherein the destination is designated first, then the source for copying is designated second. Thus, it is a destination first, source second process. (*reference: para. 0063; fig. 8 #81, #84, *85, #86, #800*) This reversal of the normal copying process is not suggested by the cited references, but is useful in solving the problem of automatically monitoring and footnoting verbatim cited material. Instead, Jacobsen describes typical downloading scenario (e.g. select source first, designate destination second); and Snag-it does not insert content into an existing user interface while viewing a file, but instead creates a new file, email, document, etc.

(2) Applicants' invention is directed towards capturing information items to complete a footnote, endnote, or bibliographical entry, such as those used commonly in scientific and educational documents. (*see para. 0027 and fig. 8 #802, for example*) Jacobsen relates to monitoring network usage, not creating footnotes, endnotes, or bibliographies. Snag-It relates to capturing images of computer screens, and is silent regarding such note creation.

(3) Applicants' invention copies non-executable text from one source document to another (*see para. 0065, for example*), while Jacobsen relates to the copying or downloading of executable software. Snag-It relates to copying images of computer screens (e.g. "screen captures"), where a screen capture is taken from a video buffer of a computer, not from a source document file.

(4) Applicants' invention is directed towards monitoring the verbatim quotation of textual source information in a new document, such as a term paper, while reporting the verbatim

quoting (e.g. direct copying) operation to a monitoring administrator. (*reference: para. 0027, 0028; fig. 9 #91*) Jacobsen is directed towards unauthorized copying of executable programs on a network, but is silent as to cutting-and-pasting program source code text into a new program, for example. Snag-it does not report their copying to an administrator other than the user doing the copying. Thus, there is no suggestion in either Jacobsen or Snag-it to add the missing step of administrator monitoring of verbatim copying of text (e.g. Jacobsen and Snag-it are distinctly separate without suggestion to incorporate parts of each other).

For these reasons, Applicants submit that Claims 1 - 33, as amended, are allowable over Jacobsen in view of Snag-It. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of these rejections and allowance of Claims 1 - 33.

Amendment to Expedite Allowance

Applicants have amended claim 1, 12, and 23 in this application. Applicants, however, are not conceding in this application that these claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner in their originally-filed form, whereas the present claim amendments are only presented for facilitating expeditious examination of some of the allowable subject matter and scope as discussed during the interview.

Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue these and other claims in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications.

Respectfully,



Robert H. Frantz, Reg. No. 42,553
Agent for Applicants
Tel: (405) 812-5613
Franklin Gray Patents, LLC